Remarks

Entry of the amendments, reconsideration of the application, as amended, and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 4-36 remain pending.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the time that was afforded applicants' attorney, Blanche E. Schiller, by Examiner Parton during a telephonic interview on February 16, 2004. During that interview, claim 1 and the cited art, Miller, were discussed. In particular, the meaning of mapping was discussed and applicants agreed to further define that term in the claims. No agreement as to the claims was reached.

With the above amendments, applicants are further clarifying the meaning of "mapping" and are further defining the term "priority." These amendments are provided in a bona fide attempt to advance prosecution of this application and not in acquiescence of the rejection. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification and drawings (e.g., pp. 57-59; FIG. 23), and therefore, no new matter is added.

In the Office Action, dated October 6, 2003, claims 1, 4, 7-15, 18-27 and 30-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,475,819). Further, claims 5, 6, 16, 17, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. in view of Cain et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,028,846). Applicants respectfully, but most strenuously, traverse these rejections to any extent deemed applicable to the claims presented herein.

In one aspect of applicants' invention, system traffic of a clustered computing environment is controlled. In order to provide this control, a particular service node address is coupled based on network topology to a particular network object that holds information regarding that service node address. For example, as shown in FIG. 23, the network topology is defined by the association of a node address definition, a subnetwork definition and a network definition. The definition for a particular node address is used to point to a particular network definition via a subnetwork definition. Thus, the node address is mapped to the network definition data. That is, one or more operations are performed on the node address to locate a particular network definition. Within the network definition data is a service routing table which

includes the priority for that service. Thus, when there are a plurality of service node addresses, each address is massaged in such a way to obtain the plurality of priorities associated with the plurality of addresses. Then, a service is contacted based on the priorities.

In one example, applicants claim a method of controlling system traffic of a clustered computing environment (e.g., claim 1). The method includes, for instance, mapping one or more node addresses, for a service to be provided, to one or more network objects defined for the service, wherein the mapping of a node address comprises performing one or more operations on the node address to locate a particular network object of a plurality of network objects, said particular network object corresponding to the node address and including a network priority assigned to the node address for the service to be provided, said network priority indicating an order of preference for using one network over another network to access the service; obtaining from the one or more network objects one or more network priorities of the service; and contacting the service based on the one or more network priorities. Thus, in applicants' claimed invention, one or more operations are performed on a node address to obtain a particular network object corresponding to that node address. The particular network object contains the network priority associated with that node address in that network. Therefore, the network priority for the service for a particular node address is obtained from a network object associated with that node address. This is very different from the teachings of Miller.

For example, Miller describes the use of a name service to obtain a network address and additional information of a service, including a priority associated with that service. There is no description, teaching or suggestion in Miller of mapping a node address to a network object to obtain the priority from the network object. That is, there is no description, teaching or suggestion in Miller of performing one or more operations on the node address to locate a particular network object that includes the priority for that network. Instead, in Miller, the service requested by a client is used to find a server entry that includes the network address and other information, including the priority. There is no massaging of or using the node address to obtain the priority. There is no mapping of the node address to obtain the network object that includes the priority, wherein the mapping includes performing one or more operations on the node address to locate a particular network object from which the network priority is retrieved,

as claimed by applicants. Instead, in Miller, the node address and priority data are in the same entry. The node address is not massaged to obtain the priority.

For example, in Col. 6, lines 58-65 of Miller it is described that when a client requests an interface which corresponds to a service group, the name service looks up information in the service group entry about the alternative servers, selects a compatible server and returns the network address to the client. Thus, the network address is merely returned to the client. Further, the attribute which includes priority, as described in Col. 7, lines 35-40, is just stored in the server entry that also includes that address. Thus, there is no need for a mapping of the node address to obtain a particular network object to obtain the priority, as claimed by applicants. The priority is just another given in Miller, along with the address. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that Miller does not describe, teach or suggest applicants' claimed element of mapping one or more node addresses for a service to be provided to one or more network objects defined for the service, wherein the mapping of a node address includes performing one or more operations on the node address to locate a particular network object of a plurality of network objects, the particular network object corresponding to the node address and including a network priority assigned to the node address for the service to be provided, the network priority indicating an order of preference for using one network over another network to access the service. Again, the network address and the priority in Miller are merely information contained in a server entry which is provided to the client when a particular interface is selected. There is no teaching or suggestion of using the network address to perform any mapping to obtain priorities.

Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and other similar claims are not anticipated by Miller. Further, applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims are patentable for the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for their own additional features. Moreover, Cain does not overcome the deficiencies of Miller. Thus, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for all pending claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact applicants' attorney at the below listed number, should the Examiner still have concerns regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Blanche E. Schiller

Blanche E. Schiller
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 35,670

Dated: March _5_, 2004.

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, New York 12203-5160
Telephone: (518) 452-5600
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579